REMARKS

The Office Action dated February 23, 2007, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response thereto. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9-11 are pending in this application and claim 8 is withdrawn. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3 and 5 are amended and new claim 11 is added. Support for the subject matter of the amendment to claim 1 can be found in the drawings at, for example, Figure 12. Support for the subject matter of the amendment to claim 5 can be found in Figure 1, and support for the subject matter of new claim 11 can be found in Figure 11. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Huang (U.S. Patent No. 6,777,819) in view of Kemmochi et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0032706); claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Huang and Kemmochi in view of Fujimoto et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0006456); claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yamada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,784,765) in view of Huang and Kemmochi; and claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yamada, Huang, Kemmochi and further in view of Fujimoto. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

In particular, the above-identified application claims a surface-mounted electronic component module that includes a wiring substrate, a plurality of electronic component devices mounted on one side of the wiring substrate, wherein the plurality of electronic component devices include a surface acoustic wave filter that is fastened face up to the one side of the wiring substrate, and a semiconductor chip that is fastened face down to

Application No. 10/615,298 Attorney Docket No. 108066-00087 the one side of the wiring substrate, and a bonding wire connected to the connection terminal of the surface acoustic wave filter with the semiconductor chip, as recited in independent claim 1.

The present application also claims a surface-mounted electronic component module that includes a wiring substrate, a semiconductor chip mounted face up on the side of the wiring substrate, and a surface acoustic wave filter <u>fastened face up and mounted on the one side</u> of the wiring substrate, as recited in independent claim 5.

Huang teaches a semiconductor package with a flash-proof device in which at least one chip and at least one passive device mounted on a substrate are covered by a flash-proof device (Abstract). Huang further teaches that on a side 200 of the substrate 20, a chip 21 and a passive device 22 are attached at predetermined positions (column 2, lines 59-63; Figure 1). However, the chip 21 and the passive device 22, which the Office Action associates to the claimed electronic component devices (Office Action, page 2, lines 11-13), do not contain a surface acoustic wave filter that is fastened face up and a semiconductor chip that is fastened face down to the one side of the wiring substrate, as recited in independent claim 1, and the face up surface acoustic wave filter similarly recited in independent claim 5. Accordingly, Huang fails to disclose or suggest these features of the independent claims.

The Office Action relies on Kemmochi to cure deficiencies in Huang in disclosing an inductance that eliminates ripples in a frequency band characteristic of the electronic component device, but Kemmochi <u>fails</u> to cure deficiencies in Huang in disclosing or rendering obvious a surface acoustic wave filter that is fastened face up to the one side of the wiring substrate and a semiconductor chip that is fastened face down to the one

Application No. 10/615,298 Attorney Docket No. 108066-00087 side of the wiring substrate, as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1, and its dependent claims 3 and 9 are patentable over a combination of Huang and Kemmochi.

Fujimoto teaches a method of manufacturing electronic parts (Abstract) and fails to cure deficiencies in Huang and Kemmochi in disclosing or rendering obvious the features of claim 3, including the features of independent claim 1.

Yamada teaches a multilayer ceramic device that improves device functionality and that reduces overall device size and profile (Abstract). The Office Action admits that Yamada fails to teach that a semiconductor chip is fastened face up and a bonding wire having a terminal connected to the surface acoustic wave filter (Office Action, page 5, lines 8-12) and relies on Huang and Kemmochi to disclose or suggest these features. However, as discussed above, Huang fails to disclose or suggest that the plurality of electronic component devices include a surface acoustic wave filter that is fastened face up and mounted on the one side of the wiring substrate, as recited in independent claim 5. Thus, a combination of Yamada, Huang and Kemmochi fails to arrive at the subject matter of independent claim 5. Accordingly, independent claim 5, and its dependent claims 7 and 10, are patentable over a combination of Yamada, Huang and Kemmochi.

Fujimoto teaches a method of manufacturing electronic parts (Abstract) and fails to cure deficiencies in Yamada, Huang and Kemmochi in disclosing or rendering obvious the features of claim 7, including the features of independent claim 5.

For at least these reasons, independent claims 1 and 5, and their dependent claims, are patentable over all the applied references. Thus, withdrawal of the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

- 9 -

Application No. 10/615,298 Attorney Docket No. 108066-00087 Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing Attorney Dkt. No. 108066-00087**.

Respectfully submitted,

Tarik M. Nabi

Registration Number 55,478

Customer Number 004372 ARENT FOX LLP 1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400 Washington, DC 20036-5339 Telephone: 202-857-6000

Fax: 202-638-4810

TMN/elz

Attachments: Request for Continued Examination (RCE)

Petition for Extension of Time (2 months)